

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
ALBANY DIVISION**

SAFER HUMAN MEDICINE, INC.,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
v.	:	CASE NO.: 1:24-CV-27 (LAG)
	:	
DECATUR COUNTY-BAINBRIDGE	:	
INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT	:	
AUTHORITY,	:	
	:	
Defendant.	:	
	:	

ORDER

Before the Court is Plaintiff’s consent Motion to Delay Issuance of the Scheduling Order (Doc. 35). Therein, Plaintiff seeks to stay discovery pending the resolution of the two motions to intervene filed in this case by the State of Georgia and Bainbridge residents June Faircloth, Chad Dollar, Lisa Dasilva, and Kristina Martin (Potential Intervenors). (*Id.*; *see* Docs. 12, 23). Plaintiff represents that “[t]he Motions to Intervene indicate the Proposed Intervenors intend to expand the issues in this proceeding beyond a basic contractual dispute,” and thus the current parties “cannot know the full extent of the issues presented and the discovery (if any) required in the case until those motions are decided.” (Doc. 35 at 1). Plaintiff further represents that the Motion is not filed for the purpose of delay, as “it is [Plaintiff’s] goal and desire that this case be resolved as expeditiously as possible” given that it “obtained a bond-validation order directing it, and [Defendant], to move forward with the project at the heart of this case well over a year ago . . . and it was ready to proceed then.” (*Id.* at 2).

District courts have broad discretion in determining whether to stay certain pretrial deadlines and discovery. *Perez v. Miami-Dade County*, 297 F.3d 1255, 1263 (11th Cir. 2002). Discovery should not, however, “be stayed as a matter of course.” *Arriaga-Zacarias v. Lewis Taylor Farms, Inc.*, No. 7:08-CV-32(HL), 2008 WL 4544470, at *1 (M.D. Ga.

Oct. 10, 2008). Indeed, “stays are disfavored unless the pending motion will dispose of the case or narrow the issues.” *Jones v. Bank of America Corp.*, 2013 WL 5657700, at *2 (M.D. Ga. Oct. 15, 2013). “The party seeking the stay must prove good cause and reasonableness.” *Arriaga-Zacarais*, 2008 WL 454470 at *1.

Plaintiff reasonably seeks to stay discovery until the Court resolves the Potential Intervenor’s Motions to Intervene (Docs. 12, 23). The granting of the Motion to Intervene, would bring in additional parties and issues that may require discovery, including the Bainbridge Resident’s allegation that Defendant violated Georgia’s Open Meetings Act, O.C.G.A. § 50-14-1(b)(2), in approving of the project at issue. (Doc. 12-1 at 2). Thus, resolving the Intervenor’s Motions to Intervene (Docs. 12, 23) will identify the remaining issues for litigation and clarify the scope of discovery. For good cause shown, Plaintiff’s Motion to Delay Issuance of the Scheduling Order (Doc. 35) is **GRANTED**.

SO ORDERED, this 8th day of August, 2025.

/s/ Leslie A. Gardner
LESLIE A. GARDNER, CHIEF JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT